

Jan/feb - 11 (MCS-Mex)

4/13/71

Dear Paul,

This is a kind of unhappy anniversary, this letter. When the Peebs (probably Army) took such good care of my previous portable, the advice of my local shop was that I get a Harsen 3000, with none but metal ~~metal~~ parts, where such destruction could not be as easy. Although I couldn't afford it, I followed his advice. I used the machine little until my old Underwood got too bad, even for me. Then I started to use this and like it. I used one ribbon, the original, put a new one in, and lo and behold, besides tearing and punching everything I did, it also bisected the ribbon. These diagnosis proved correct. This "Uniline" of portables has an inferior platen when new, something in the compound the meticulous design was. From I got it back today. Most of use equal to the life of the first ribbon, 10.66—and that with the kindness of the dealer in charging nothing for his labor or the rental during repair.

After this, this comment on your excellent 4/3 to Kleinleut. Have you decided why Sam Stern's draft was not sent? Without knowing that, I've a hunch you'd best be careful about later use of the auto device. The fourth paragraph, if you will, you might want to break down some, perhaps easier to complain, to keep one from working against the others. Do you feel that this includes, the way they'll interpret, notes, including handwritten, and possible to post?

I'm glad somebody else is throwing Clark at them. For more than four years I've been so lonely. If you do not recall their interpretation from the sources, I've sent you, tell me and I'll repeat it.

There was once a time I was alone in getting delays, from all sources. It is good to be in company. Welcome to the club! But I've had them go much longer.

By today's, to the expert on ~~breakout~~ irresponsibility, not to his assistant Fine who isn't. I'm happy to keep it in sights and in responsibility, not to deal with those to whom he passes the buck. Let him refer, but my copies, I think, will usually be addressed to him, esp. when I have a complaint. In this case I'm stretching something. The law requires no more than that I identify. The letter did that, he knew the letter did that, he wanted to put me to trouble, so that for tit-and I'm in compliance. I wish I had time and resources to load them with suits, where I've exhausted my remedies. If I return to AGAIN OSAGE, which is now more timely and more possible, I think I'll file a couple more, including those you like, the fingerprint ones (remember, Wasp?) probably follow your advice & and write three beginning with the form on the pre-acc pix (they have to have the TV stuff and what was in it the file because of that, return, watching and, I think, recruiting. And I'll throw Dallas-Fort Worth in too, on that.

In your own thinking, never forget the clause of the investigative exemption they also ya omit, for if, in a trial, it could have been available to LIO or Ruby, the exemption no longer obtain. Or to any other litigant not an agency. I don't get answers, but I make a record, when I think of it, and ask "what law"? They haven't any. And don't forget what you haven't seen, not having seen that book I filed in 2569-70, that one of the reasons this law was enacted was to eliminate the "national interest" hoax. Here the House Report is esp. good.

You indicate no distribution. I include a copy for JMS if you've sent this to him.

Best,

RW